



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,299	07/28/2006	Laurent Mainard	33155.37	4048
7590 08/12/2008				
Gerald E Helget Briggs and Morgan 80 South Eighth Street Suite 2200 Minneapolis, MN 55402			EXAMINER DENNISON, JERRY B	
			ART UNIT 2143	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/12/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/580,299

**Applicant(s)**

MAINARD, LAURENT

**Examiner**

J. Bret Dennison

**Art Unit**

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/02)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Action is in response to Application Number 10/580,299 received on 5/16/2006.
2. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 2, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claim 2 recites the limitation, "the other client of the collaboration session " in the last line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. Claim 3 recites the limitation, "the temporal information" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 1-5, 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Qi et al. (US 2004/0215784).

7. Regarding claims 1, 7, and 12-16, Qi disclosed a method of transferring at least one message for the establishment of a collaboration session (126) by a manager (125) of a collaboration session between a plurality of clients, characterized in that a messaging system (122) is associated with the collaboration session manager and in that the method comprises the steps of:

the reception (E500), by the messaging system associated with the collaboration session manager, of a message generated by a collaboration session client, the message comprising a plurality of addresses of clients of the collaboration session (Qi, [0023]),

the activation (E508) of a collaboration session by the collaboration session manager (Qi, [0025], Qi disclosed the starting of the collaboration session after receiving the request, by first setting up the participants),

the obtaining (E513) of an identifier for the collaboration session activated (Qi, [0026], [0030]),

the transfer (E515), for the establishment of the collaboration session, of at least one message intended for each collaboration session client address, the message comprising the identifier of the collaboration session activated (Qi, [0026]).

Claim 7 includes a method with limitations that are substantially similar to claim 1. Claims 12 and 13 include a device with limitations that are substantially similar to claim 1. Claim 14 includes a system with limitations that are substantially similar to claim 1. Claims 15 and 16 include a computer program with limitations that are substantially similar to claim 1. Qi disclosed a method, device, system, and program performing these limitations (Qi, [0007]-[0012], [0021]). As such, claims 7 and 12-16 are rejected under the same rationale.

8. Regarding claim 2, Qi disclosed the limitations as described in claim 1, characterized in that the message generated by the client of the collaboration session is an electronic message comprising the messaging address of the client who generated the message and the messaging address of the other client of the collaboration session (Qi, [0023]).

9. Regarding claim 3, Qi disclosed the limitations as described in claim 2, characterized in that the temporal information is associated with the electronic message (Qi, [0026]).

10. Regarding claim 4, Qi disclosed the limitations as described in claim 2, characterized in that other messaging addresses are included in the electronic message and the method also comprises a step of determining, amongst the messaging addresses included in the electronic message, messaging addresses of the clients of the collaboration session (Qi, [0023]).

11. Regarding claim 5, Qi disclosed the limitations as described in claim 4, characterized in that a plurality of messaging addresses are associated with the messaging system associated with the collaboration session manager, and a type collaboration session corresponds to each messaging address (Qi, [0023], [0029]).

12. Regarding claim 8, Qi disclosed the limitations as described in claim 7, characterized in that the message generated by the messaging system associated with a collaboration session manager is an electronic message and in that temporal information is associated with the electronic message (Qi, [0023], [0026]).

13. Regarding claim 9, Qi disclosed the limitations as described in claim 8, characterized in that, prior to the establishment of the session (i.e. the first user to start the collaboration session), the method also comprises the steps of:

displaying the identifier of the collaboration session (Qi, [0030], invitees are provided with the identifier, and also must provide the identifier which clearly would utilize displaying the identifier),

detecting a command made by the client for establishing the collaboration session ([0030], First user's request to would establish the session).

14. Regarding claim 10, Qi disclosed the limitations as described in claim 9, characterized in that, prior to the step of establishing a collaboration session, the method comprises a step of activating collaboration software associated with the client (Qi, [0020], a client establishing a session clearly requires the client to use collaboration software).

15. Regarding claim 11, Qi disclosed the limitations as described in claim 10, characterized in that the method also comprises the step of generating, by means of the messaging system associated with the client of collaboration session, a message intended for the messaging system associated with the collaboration session manager, the message comprising the messaging address of the client of the collaboration session (Qi, [0023], [0026], [0028]).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qi in view of Costa-Requena et al. (US 2004/0202303).

16. Regarding claim 6, Qi disclosed the limitations as described in claim 5. Qi did not explicitly state wherein accreditations are allocated to the clients of the collaboration session and the message transferred to each client of the collaboration session comprises the allocated accreditation.

In an analogous art, Costa-Requena disclosed setting up a collaboration session in which an invite message sent to all invitees includes a URL that provides a list of participants of the collaboration session (Costa-Requena, [0029]). As such, the URL supplied in the message provides the allocated accreditation of all the clients.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Qi and Costa-Requena since both provide teachings pertaining to user collaboration and as such, both are within the same environment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate using the URL supplied in Qi to provide a list of the participants of the collaboration session in order to obtain the predictable result of notifying invitees of who will be attending the collaboration session, to thereby provide a system that better informs the users about such collaboration sessions.

### ***Conclusion***



**Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (571) 272-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2143

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jerry Dennison/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2143